



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/544,709	04/06/2000	Vipin Samar	OR99-17501	9115

22835 7590 12/31/2003

PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
508 SECOND STREET
SUITE 201
DAVIS, CA 95616

EXAMINER

HENEGHAN, MATTHEW E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2134

DATE MAILED: 12/31/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/544,709

Applicant(s)

SAMAR, VIPIN

Examiner

Matthew Heneghan

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 April 2000 and 07 May 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-55 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-55 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 April 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2,3 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-55 have been examined. Claims 52-55 were added by preliminary amendment.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. Information Disclosure Statements filed on 6 April 2000 and 28 April 2000 have been considered.
3. The Information Disclosure Statement filed on 1 August 2000, Paper No. 4, is missing from the application file wrapper and has not been considered. Please submit another copy with a postcard receipt if available.

Drawings

4. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "120" has been used to designate both "JVM" and "password store" (see page 9, lines 10 and 16) in the specification; and reference character "161" has been used to designate both "application" and "applet" (see page 11, line 1) in the specification. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

5. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: "171"- "173" on page 9, line 6; "108" on page 9, line 22. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

6. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description: Figure 1, "182" and "183"; figure 3, "300" and "308"; figure 4, "400" and "410"; figure 5, "500" and "508." A proposed drawing correction, corrected drawings, or amendment to the specification to add the reference sign(s) in the description, are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

7. The use of the trademark JAVA™ has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claim 1-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1, 18, 35, 52, and 55 recite the limitation "the plurality of applications" in the third limitation. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For purposes of the prior art search, the phrase is being presumed to mean "a plurality of applications."

Regarding claims 10, 27, and 44, the phrase "can include" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitation(s) following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. For purposes of the prior art search, the limitations recited after the phrase are being treated as a Markush group.

Claims 3-5, 20-22, 37-39, and 54 provide for the use of JAVA applets but does not clearly define JAVA, or identify its trademark, rendering them indefinite.

All other claims depend from rejected claims 1, 18, 35, or 52, and include all the limitations of the respective claims, thereby rendering those dependent claims indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

9. Claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 11-13, 17-19, 23, 25, 26, 28-30, 34-36, 40, 42, 43, 45-47, 51-53, and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,790,785 to Klug et al.

As per claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 11-13, 18, 19, 23, 25, 26, 28-30, 35, 36, 40, 42, 43, 45-47, and 55, the registration information processing system disclosed by Klug receives a password request (or sets up a new password for the user), authenticating it on behalf of the application, looks up the password for the application in the user registration information database (or creates it automatically or in cooperation with the user) and sends it to the application (see column 6, line 37 to column 7, line 60).

As per claims 17, 34, and 51, the new password information can be created by the system in response to actions by the remote application (see column 11, lines 31-63).

As per claims 52 and 53, the user can retrieve id and password information for the application and send it back to the user (see column 13, lines 39-49).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 3-5, 20-22, 37-39, and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,790,785 to Klug et al.

Klug discloses the implementation of the registration system by using HTML (see column 4, lines 31-37), but does not explicitly disclose the use of JAVA.

Official notice is given that it is well-known in the art that the JAVA programming language is incorporated into HTML in order to give increased programming flexibility, and that the use of certificate chains in JAVA applets is a well-known method for efficiently keeping track of trusted remote sites.

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the system disclosed by Klug using JAVA, in order to give increased programming flexibility, and to use certificate chains in JAVA applets, in order to efficiently keep track of trusted remote sites.

11. Claims 7, 15, 24, 32, 41, and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,790,785 to Klug et al. as applied to claims 1, 18, and 35, above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,611,048 to Jacobs et al.

Klug does not disclose the use of location information in the authentication process, or the storing of the password database separate from the password server.

As per claims 7, 24, and 41, the remote password administration system disclosed by Jacobs authenticates users using node id's in addition to passwords (see column 9, line 66 to column 10, line 28). Jacobs further suggests that the criteria for valid passwords vary between security systems, and that it is important to coordinate passwords between local nodes and servers.

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system disclosed by Klug by authenticating users using node id's in addition to passwords, since criteria for valid passwords vary between security systems and it is important to coordinate passwords between local nodes and servers.

As per claims 15, 32, and 49, the login information is stored in a separate database server apart from the mainframe (see abstract). Jacobs further suggests that this is to administrate and coordinate passwords across two or more security systems in a network (see column 2, lines 2-7).

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the system disclosed by Klug by storing login

information in a separate database server apart from the mainframe, in order to administrate and coordinate passwords across two or more security systems in a network.

12. Claims 10, 14, 16, 27, 31, 33, 44, 48, and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,790,785 to Klug et al. as applied to claims 1, 18, and 35, above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,623,637 to Jones et al.

Klug does not disclose the storage of passwords on a removable medium, or the storage of the passwords in an encrypted manner, or authentication using smart cards or public keys.

As per claims 10, 27, and 44, the smartcard disclosed by Jones allows for the storage of public keys, in order to send secure transmissions to a remote receiving computer (see column 9, lines 38-47).

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system disclosed by Klug by storing public keys, in order to send secure transmissions to a remote receiving computer.

As per claims 14, 16, 31, 33, 48, and 50, the data storage card disclosed by Jones stores encrypted password values in a smartcard (see column 2, lines 30-43), and suggests that this is to allow the secure storage of private information in a compact easily transportable storage device, protected against unauthorized access if it is lost or stolen (see column 1, lines 61-67).

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the system disclosed by Klug by storing encrypted password values in a smartcard, as disclosed by Jones, in order to allow the secure storage of private information in a compact easily transportable storage device, protected against unauthorized access if it is lost or stolen.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent No. 5,706,427 to Tabuki discloses a system for network user authentication for using applications.

U.S. Patent No. 5,872,915 to Dykes et al. discloses an apparatus for enabling web access to a variety of applications for a computer passing security checks.

U.S. Patent No. 6,000,033 to Kelley et al. discloses a process for providing passwords to application clients over the web.

U.S. Patent No. 6,141,760 to Abadi et al. discloses a system for generalizing access passwords.

U.S. Patent No. 6,182,229 to Nielsen discloses a system for providing web site access to a client using a master password.

U.S. Patent No. 6,223,292 to Dean et al. discloses an authorization system for accessing software products.

U.S. Patent No. 6,269,395 to Blatherwick et al. discloses a system for supplying application access from different access points.

U.S. Patent No. 6,412,073 to Rangan discloses a menu system for allowing user access to multiple secure web sites.

U.S. Patent No. 6,460,141 to Olden discloses a system for network access to applications.

U.S. Patent No. 6,496,855 to Hunt et al. discloses a web registration proxy.

U.S. Patent No. 6,629,246 to Gadi discloses a system for a user to sign on to multiple servers simultaneously using a single password.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew E. Heneghan, whose telephone number is (703) 305-7727. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00 AM - 4:00 PM Eastern Time. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse, can be reached on (703) 308-4789.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, DC 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 2, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA 22202, Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

Application/Control Number: 09/544,709
Art Unit: 2134


Page 11

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

MEH



December 15, 2003



GREGORY MORSE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100